

| ITN | NTRP | NATIONAL TENNIS RATING PROGRAM | | | | | |
|------|------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| | | FOREHAND | BACKHAND | SERVE OR RETURN OF SERVE | VOLLEY | SPECIAL SHOTS | PLAYING STYLE |
| 10.1 | | | | | | | |
| 10.3 | 1.0 | This player is just starting to play tennis. | | | | | |
| 10 | 1.5 | This player has limited experience and is still working primarily on getting the ball into play. | | | | | |
| 9 | 2.0 | Incomplete swing; lacks directional intent | Avoids backhands; erratic contact; grip problems; incomplete swing | Incomplete service motion; double faults common; toss is inconsistent; return of serve erratic | Reluctant to play net; avoids backhand; lacks footwork | | Familiar with basic positions for singles and doubles play; frequently out of position |
| 8 | 2.5 | Form developing; prepared for moderately paced shots | Grip and preparation problems; often chooses to hit forehand instead of backhand | Attempting a full swing; can get the ball in play at slow pace; inconsistent toss; can return slow-paced serve | Uncomfortable at net, especially on the backhand side; frequently uses forehand racquet face on backhand volleys | Can lob intentionally but with little control; can make contact on overheads | Can sustain a short rally of slow pace; modest consistency; weak court coverage; usually remains in the initial doubles position |
| 7 | 3.0 | Fairly consistent with some directional intent; lacks depth control | Frequently prepared; starting to hit with fair consistency on moderate shots | Developing rhythm; little consistency when trying for power; second serve is often considerably slower than first serve; can return serve with fair consistency | Consistent forehand volley; inconsistent backhand volley; has trouble with low and wide shots | Can lob fairly consistently on moderate shots | Fairly consistent on medium-paced shots; most common doubles formation is still one up, one back; approaches net when play dictates but weak in execution |
| 6 | 3.5 | Improved consistency and variety on moderate shots with directional control; developing spin | Hits with directional control on moderate shots; has difficulty on high or hard shots; returns difficult shots defensively | Starting to serve with control and some power; developing spin; can return serve consistently with directional control on moderate shots | More aggressive net play; some ability to cover side shots; uses proper footwork; can direct forehand volleys; controls backhand volley but with little offense; difficulty in putting volleys away | Consistent overhead on shots within reach; developing approach shots, drop shots, and half volleys | Improved consistency on moderate shots with directional control; improved court coverage; starting to look for the opportunity to come to the net; developing teamwork in doubles |
| 5 | 4.0 | Good consistency; hits with depth and control on moderate shots; may try to hit too good a placement on a difficult shot | Directs the ball with consistency and depth on moderate shots; developing spin | Places both first and second serves, often with power on first serve; uses spin; dependable return of serve; can return with depth in singles and mix returns in doubles | Depth and control on forehand volley; can direct backhand volleys but usually lacks depth; developing wide and low volleys on both sides of the body | Can put away easy overheads; can poach in doubles; follows aggressive shots to the net; beginning to finish point off; can hit to opponent's weaknesses; able to lob defensively on difficult shots and offensively on set-ups | Good consistency on ground strokes with directional control and depth demonstrated on moderate shots; not yet playing good percentage tennis; teamwork in doubles is evident; rallies may still be lost due to impatience |
| 4 | 4.5 | Very good consistency; uses speed and spin effectively; controls depth well; tends to over-hit on difficult shots; offensive on moderate shots | Can control direction and depth but may break down under pressure; offensive on moderate shots | Aggressive serving with limited double faults; uses power and spin; developing offense; on second serve frequently hits with good depth and placement; frequently hits aggressive service returns; can take pace off with moderate success in doubles | Can handle a mixed sequence of volleys; good footwork; has depth and directional control on backhand; developing touch; most common error is still overhitting | Hits approach shots with good depth and control; can consistently hit volleys and overheads to end the point | Very good consistency; more intentional variety in game; is hitting with more pace; covers up weaknesses well; beginning to vary game plan according to opponent; aggressive net play is common in doubles; good anticipation; beginning to handle pace |
| 3 | 5.0 | Strong shots with control, depth, and spin; uses forehand to set up offensive situations; has developed good touch; consistent on passing shots | Can use backhand as an aggressive shot with good consistency; has good direction and depth on most shots; varies spin | Serve is placed effectively with intent of hitting to a weakness or developing an offensive situation; has a variety of serves to rely on; good depth, spin, and placement on most second serves to force weak return or set up next shot; can mix aggressive and off-paced service returns with control, depth, and spin | Can hit most volleys with depth, pace and direction; plays difficult volleys with depth; given an opportunity volley is often hit for a winner | Approach shots and passing shots are hit with pace and high degree of effectiveness; can lob offensively; overhead can be hit from any position; hits mid-court volleys with consistency | Frequently has an outstanding shot, consistency, or attribute around which game is built; can vary game plan according to opponent; this player is "match wise," plays percentage tennis and "beats himself or herself" less than the 4.5 player; solid teamwork in doubles is evident; game breaks down mentally and physically more often than the 5.5 player |
| 2 | 5.5 | This player is capable of hitting dependable shots in stress situations; has developed good anticipation; can pick up cues from such things as opponent's toss, body position, backswing, preparation; first and second serves can be depended on in stress situations and can be hit offensively at any time; can analyze and exploit opponent's weaknesses; can vary strategies and style of play in a competitive situation. | | | | Players in Wheelchairs: Players in wheelchairs should use these general characteristics to determine their NTRP skill level. The only differences are as follows: Mobility: While players in wheelchairs may have skills that would normally provide them a certain rating, the mobility factor suggests that when competing against able-bodied players, they should participate at an NTRP skill level that provides for competitive rather than compatible play. Serving ability: Due to the nature of the player's injury or disability, a powerful serve may not be possible. In this case, it may be more realistic to self-rate below 4.0, as service strength becomes key beyond this level. Many tournament players in wheelchairs have already received an NTRP rating. Wheelchair players should check with players whose skills match their own before determining their rating. The very best world-class players in wheelchairs have an NTRP rating in the low 4.5s. | |
| 1 | 6.0 to 7.0 | These players will generally not need NTRP ratings. Rankings or past rankings will speak for themselves. The 6.0 player typically has had intensive training for national tournament competition at the junior level and collegiate levels and has obtained a sectional and/or national ranking. The 6.5 player has a reasonable chance of succeeding at the 7.0 level and has extensive satellite tournament experience. The 7.0 is a world-class player who is committed to tournament competition on the international level and whose major source of income is tournament prize winnings. | | | | | |



**General & Experienced Player Guidelines
Supplement to the NTRP Guidelines**

| Supplement to the NTRP Guidelines | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| NTRP General Characteristics | 7.0 | 6.5 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 2.5 | |
| | <i>You are a world-class player.</i> | <i>You are currently playing USTA circuit events in hopes of a professional tennis career.</i> | <i>You have had intensive training for national tournament competition at the junior and collegiate levels and have obtained a sectional and/or national ranking.</i> | <i>You have mastered power and/or consistency as a major weapon. You can vary strategies and styles of play in a competitive situation and hit dependable shots in a stress situation.</i> | <i>You have good shot anticipation and frequently have an outstanding shot or attribute around which a game may be structured. You can regularly hit winners or force errors off of short balls and can put away volleys. You can successfully execute lobs, drop shots, half volleys, overhead smashes, and have good depth and spin on most second serves.</i> | <i>You have developed your use of power and spin and can handle pace. You have sound footwork, can control depth of shots, and attempt to vary game plan according to your opponents. You can hit first serves with power and accuracy and place the second serve. You tend to overhit on difficult shots. Aggressive net play is common in doubles.</i> | <i>You have dependable strokes, including directional control and depth on both forehand and backhand sides on moderate-paced shots. You can use lobs, overheads, approach shots and volleys with some success and occasionally force errors when serving. Rallies may be lost due to impatience. Teamwork in doubles is evident.</i> | <i>This player has achieved improved stroke dependability with directional control on moderate shots, but still lacks depth and variety. This player exhibits more aggressive net play, has improved court coverage, and is developing teamwork in doubles.</i> | <i>This player is fairly consistent when hitting medium paced shots, but is not comfortable with all strokes and lacks execution when trying for directional control, depth, or power. Most common doubles formation is one-up, one-back.</i> | <i>This player is learning to judge where the ball is going although court coverage is weak. Can sustain a short rally of slow pace with other players of the same ability.</i> | |
| | World Class Players (top 400 in world) | Current | Age 35 and under | Age 40 and under | Age 41 to 50 | Age 51 to 60 | Age 61 and over | Players in wheelchairs should use these same General Characteristics to determine their NTRP skill level. The only difference observed is mobility and power on the serve based on the severity of the injury. The very best World Class players in wheelchairs have an NTRP rating in the low 4.5 range. | | | |
| | Satellite, Futures, Circuit Players (over # 400 in world) | | Current | Age 35 and under | Age 36 - 45 | Age 46 to 55 | Age 56 and over | | | | |
| | Div. 1 Top 75 ranked college team or player | | | Age 30 and under | Age 31 to 40 | Age 41 to 50 | Age 51 to 60 | | | | |
| | Div. 1 unranked college team or player; NAIA, Div. 2 & 3 top ranked college team or player | | | | Age 30 and under | Age 31 to 45 | Age 46 - 55 | Age 56 and over | For more details concerning specific playing characteristics, see NTRP Specific Characteristics on www.usta.com/leagues | | |
| | Domestic or foreign Junior 18's ranked in top 150 nationally or in a section in the top 20 | | | | Age 30 and under | Age 31 to 45 | Age 46 - 55 | Age 56 and over | | | |
| | Domestic or foreign Adults ranked in the top 20 nationally or in a section in the top 10 | | | | Age 30 and under | Age 31 to 45 | Age 46 - 55 | Age 56 and over | | | |
| | NAIA, Div. 2 & 3 unranked college team player -program with no scholarships (not much stronger than High School tennis); Junior College player; Former Juniors who had national (foreign or domestic) rankings but did not tour or play in college | | | | | | Age 35 and under | Age 36 and over | | | |
| | Tennis Professionals | | | | | | | Minimum level | | | |
| High school tennis athlete may not self-rate below 3.0 and should consider their high school experience when self-rating | | | | | | | | Successful High School Experience | High School Experience | | |
| Players new to tennis who have had competitive experience in other sports should consider the rapid improvement anticipated and not rate below 3.0 | | | | | | | | | Athletic ability | | |
| The USA League Tennis Committee has approved these guidelines as a tool for accurate self-rating and NTRP Self-rate Grievance decisions. These guidelines will be advertised to players and captains and will be considered fair warning to players and captains who commit or condone future self rating abuses. USA League Tennis Grievance Committees may suspend captains for condoning self rating abuses. Grievance committees have the authority to dismiss complaints or alter the application of these guidelines when they deem appropriate. The USA League Tennis Committee asks all players, captains, coordinators, tennis professionals and volunteers to join the campaign to maintain the integrity of the NTRP Rating System! 2003, 2004 and Current college team rankings for Div 1, Div 2, Div 3, NAIA and Junior colleges may be found at www.itatennis.com . Click on tab at top of website titled "College Tennis Online" for individual player searches. <div>updated November 2005</div> | | | | | | | | | | | |